

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE C.V. NAGARJUNA REDDY
AND
HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE GUDISEVA SHYAM PRASAD

WRIT PETITION No.20656 of 2018

Date: 25-07-2018

Between :

T. Sunitha

... Petitioner

And

The State of Andhra Pradesh,
Rep. by its Chief Secretary,
Secretariat Buildings, Amaravathi
at Velagapudi

... Respondents

Counsel for petitioner : Sri D. Purna Chandra Reddy

Counsel for respondents : Sri C.S. Surya Prakash Rao,
Special Government Pleader (AP)

THE COURT MADE THE FOLLOWING:

ORDER: (*per* Hon'ble Sri Justice C.V. Nagarjuna Reddy)

This writ petition is filed for issue of Habeas Corpus to direct the respondents to release forthwith Thambisetty Akkaiah s/o. Late Venkatapathi (detenu) after quashing the proceedings in Ref.C1(M)/13/2018, dated 9-4-2018 of respondent No.2, as confirmed vide G.O.Rt.No.1273, General Administration (SC.1) Department, dated 12-6-2018, issued by respondent No.1.

At the hearing, the only ground urged by Sri D. Purna Chandra Reddy, learned Counsel for the detenu is that out of 16 criminal cases referred to in the detention order, bail was granted in 11 cases. He has further submitted that as on the date of passing of the detention order, the detenu was in judicial custody though he was granted bail in 11 cases and that though respondent No.2 has shown his awareness of the detenu being in judicial custody at the time of passing of the order, he has not recorded his satisfaction that the detenu is likely to be released on bail and on such release, he is likely to repeat commission of similar offences prejudicial to the maintenance of public order.

The learned Special Government Pleader representing the State of Andhra Pradesh is unable to show either from the

detention order or from the grounds of detention that respondent No.2 has recorded his satisfaction of the likelihood of the detenu coming out on bail and repeat his activities.

In **N. Meera Rani v. Government of Tamil Nadu**¹ , the Supreme Court held as under:

“Applying the above settled principle to the facts of the present case we have no doubt that the detention order, in the present case, must be quashed for this reason alone. The detention order read with its annexure indicates the detaining authority’s awareness of the fact of detenu’s jail custody at the time of the making of the detention order. However, there is no indication therein that the detaining authority considered it likely that the detenu could be released on bail. In fact, the contents of the order, particularly, the above quoted para 18 show the satisfaction of the detaining authority that there was ample material to prove the detenu’s complicity in the bank dacoity including sharing of the booty in spite of absence of his name in the FIR as one of the dacoits. On these facts, the order of detention passed in the present case on September 7, 1988 and its confirmation by the State Government on October 25, 1988 is clearly invalid since the same was made when the detenu was already in jail custody for the offence of bank dacoity with no prospect of his release. It does not satisfy the test indicated by the Constitution Bench in *Rameshwar Shaw v. District Magistrate, Burdwan* (AIR 1964 SC 334). We hold the detention order to be invalid for this reason alone and express no opinion on merits about the grounds of detention.”

In view of failure on the part of respondent No.2 to record his satisfaction as referred to above, the impugned order

¹ (1989) 4 SCC 418

of detention is unsustainable and the same is liable to be set aside.

For the aforementioned reasons, the writ petition is allowed and the impugned detention order vide Ref.C1(M)13/2018, dated 9-4-2018 passed by respondent No.2, as confirmed vide G.O.Rt.No.1273, General Administration (SC.I) Department, dated 12-6-2018 issued by respondent No.1, is set aside.

C.V. NAGARJUNA REDDY, J

GUDISEVA SHYAM PRASAD, J

Dt.25-07-2018

AM

